



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

diately outlaws himself. He becomes so much vermin, to be ruthlessly exterminated.

The syndicalist is a race suicider. He knows that children are a detriment to him in his daily struggle.

These, and more like them, were the deliberately formulated and published doctrines of this strike leader, who declared himself a syndicalist and revolutionist. Confronted with them by a Senate investigating committee, he would neither confirm them nor repudiate them in straightforward fashion, but shuffled and prevaricated until he had made of himself one of the most humiliating and contemptible exhibitions of moral poltroonery ever seen on the witness stand. And this was the man at whose word a universal strike was to be ordered and all the activities of the nation were to be brought to a standstill.

Strikes are always regrettable. Sometimes they are necessary. With an honest strike for legitimate ends which could be attained in no other way, the American public never fails to sympathize. But it can have no sympathy with a strike for such objects as this one had, no matter who its leaders might be; nor could it have any sympathy with a strike for any objects whatever, under such leadership as this one suffered.

### THE LAST RELIC OF MONARCHISM

---

CARLYLE was right. "Hero worship exists, has existed, and will forever exist, universally among mankind." We may not, however, invariably define the hero, in Carlyle's phrase, as a "sincere man," nor see him as comparable companion of the mighty figures which the Sage of Craigenputtoch idealized and apotheosized. Rather is the inclination one to follow a single leader rather than a company, and to give attachment to an individual, rather than to the mass. We are told in Scripture and in fable that both the Israelites and the frogs desired a king; and though in neither case was the wisdom of the desire justified in the granting of it, the same hankering appears to persist among men, if not among frogs, to this day. One single man commands too often the fancy and the fealty of the people, more than any company of men united can do.

It is on this ground alone that we can explain the tendency of many people always to side with the President against the Congress. We speak now, of course, not of the comparatively few who profess to side with him on principle and through conviction, but of that vastly greater proportion of his supporters who frankly admit that they know little of the matter at issue and have no personal convictions upon it, but simply side with the President because he is the President, and because they prefer his judgment to that of Congress. It is safe to estimate that at heart this is the attitude in the present controversy of four-fifths of the President's popular supporters.

There is indeed no conceivable ground for their preferring the President's judgment to that of Congress, excepting that he is one while it is many. In experience in public service, and in knowledge of and familiarity with public affairs, many of them surpass him; he would himself be the first to acknowledge that. In loyalty to American principles and in unselfish devotion to American interests, it would be odious to insinuate that the great majority of members of both houses were not fully comparable with the President.

There remains one other criterion, that of representative capacity. The President himself has plausibly argued that he is more truly representative of the people than Congress is, because he alone is chosen by all the people; or he and the Vice-President. A Representative is chosen by the people of a single district, and a Senator by those of a single State; but the President and Vice-President are the choice of the people of all the districts and all the States. That is a fact, but the argument based upon it is more plausible than convincing. For it is obvious that each Representative or Senator is much nearer to the people of his district or State than the President is to the people of the whole country. In many districts the majority of citizens are personally acquainted with their Representative, and even some Senators are very widely known, personally known, to the citizens of their States. But of the whole nation, only a microscopic minority personally know the President. Therefore, since each member of Congress is much more representative of his constituents than the President is of his, the whole company of members must be more repre-

sentative of the whole mass of their constituencies, that is, of the nation, than is the President.

They are also closer to and more representative of the nation in point of time. The President was chosen by the people in 1916, and therefore represents them as they were and as their desires and purposes were at that time. But Congress—the whole House and the control of the Senate—was elected two years later, in 1918. It represents the people as the people were less than a year ago, instead of nearly three years ago. The President certainly does not represent them as they were so recently, because his self-sought test conclusively proved that if he had been before the people for election as President in 1918 he would not have been chosen.

We are therefore compelled to revert to the original proposition, that people prefer the President's leadership to that of Congress simply because he is one and it is many. It is the last relic of monarchism, the lingering, attenuated, half-conscious desire of the people for a king to rule over them. There is doubtless no danger that it will be carried so far as to overturn republican institutions, for not even those who are victims of the strange obsession would probably let it carry them so far, and they are happily only a minority of the nation. Yet it is something more than an incongruity for people of a democracy, who profess to have been battling for the sake of democracy in the world, to take and to maintain such an attitude.

The worst feature of it is that it seriously impairs the value of the national councils. It makes the discussions one-sided. Point out what seems to be an error in a proposed treaty, and the only reply is, The President wants it so. Suggest an amendment which would improve it, and the reply is, The President does not want it. The merits of the case are nothing; the personal factor is all. You cannot argue with those who do nothing but cry "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!"

We would not for a moment in the least depreciate or impair the importance and dignity of the Presidential office, nor ignore the great value at times of the President's personal leadership. There are occasions when the personal initiative of one strong man is invaluable. There is never a time when the nation ought not to listen thoughtfully and

respectfully to whatever the President has to recommend. The Constitution makes it a part of his duty, which he has sworn to perform, to recommend to the consideration of Congress, from time to time, such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient. Note, however, that he is not to dictate such measures to Congress for enactment, but merely to recommend them for consideration. Between the two there is a world of difference.

We have said that the hero-worshipping tendency impairs the value of the national councils. It does more than that. It impairs the proper authority of the President himself. As the Chief Executive, enforcing the legislative will of the representatives of the people, giving information of the state of the Union, and making occasional recommendations for Congress to consider and to act upon according to its own untrammelled and unbiased judgment, he commands the utmost respect and confidence of the nation, regardless of party. As a would-be dictator, pretending to be more representative of the people than Congress can be, and seeking to impose his will upon Congress through the exercise of those influences which President Wilson himself has so accurately described, he abdicates his high position, provokes resentments and animosities, and degrades himself to the level of a factional self-seeker. Those who through this lingering trace of monarchism make him the object of personal adulation, do him therefore a gross disservice.

There is no wiser nor more prudent provision of the American Constitution than that which discriminates between the respective functions of the co-ordinate departments of the Government, and in doing so definitely establishes the proper powers and duties of the President. It will be remembered that there was more deliberation and discussion concerning the Presidency than on most other topics in the Constitution, the dangers being that on the one hand he would be too much of a monarch, and on the other that he would be too much the mere tool of Congress. There was general satisfaction in the result, and a belief that a happy medium had been secured between the two extremes; so that the status of the President has since been regarded as one of the best achievements of the Constitution-makers, and has been envied and emulated in other

republics of subsequent organization. It would be regrettable now to have that fine achievement marred by the injudicious zeal of hero-worshippers.

The difference between a monarchy and a democracy is not so much in name and form as in spirit, and the spirit that would make one man supreme over many, that would prefer the judgment and authority of a single officer to those of the numerous directly and more recently elected representatives of the people, is not the spirit of democracy but of monarchy. It is the last relic of monarchism, which may indeed, as Carlyle said, forever exist, but which, for the welfare of the republic, should be held in academic abeyance and never be permitted to sway the judgment of men or to determine the destinies of the nation.